



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III.—THE DRAMATIC SYNCHOREGIA AT ATHENS.

The discovery and publication in recent years of a large body of new material bearing on the choregia, and the fruitful labors of Lipsius, Reisch, Köhler, Bergk, Brinck and others upon this material, have made it possible at the present time to present in its general outlines, with essential accuracy, the history of the most important branch of the subject—the dramatic choregia at Athens during the fifth and fourth centuries. But to any one who musters the sources it soon becomes apparent that there are several serious lacunae in our knowledge, and several points at which the details in the history still elude our grasp. It is the purpose of this paper to supply, if possible, some of these details, by a re-examination of the inscriptional evidence and by combining with it some evidence, hitherto overlooked, derived from the contemporary literature.

Our knowledge of the institution of the dramatic synchoregia depends, in the first instance, on a statement of Aristotle quoted by the scholiast to Aristoph. Ran. 404, to the effect that under the archonship of Callias a decree was passed providing that two choregi, instead of one, should be appointed for each tragic and comic poet for the Dionysia. The correctness of this statement is attested by a number of inscriptions.

Was the Callias under whom this change was made *ὁ μετὰ Κλεόκριτον* (412/11) or *ὁ μετ' Ἀντιγόνη* (406/5)? The earlier view of Böckh¹—now held by Brinck,² Oehmichen,³ and Gilbert⁴—favors the earlier date. The more natural opinion, however, held by A. Müller, Reisch and others, follows the statement of the

¹ Staatshaushaltung³, I, p. 538, corrected in the footnote from Böckh's own notes.

² Inscriptiones graecae ad choregiam pertinentes, p. 92 ff.

³ Oehmichen, Bühnenwesen, p. 196. He doubts, however, the correctness of the notice of the scholiast, "trotzdem sie sich mit der Autorität des Aristoteles brüstet." Lys. 21, 1, which he quotes in support, simply calls for a date later than 411.

⁴ Constitutional Antiquities, p. 360, n. 1. To the above names may be added Bodensteiner, Ueber choregische Weihinschriften, p. 78, and Bethe, De scaenicarum certaminum victoribus, p. 7.

scholiast, who identifies the Callias in question with the Callias under whom the *Frogs* was produced. It may be claimed, however, that the identification rests on the authority of the scholiast alone; that Aristotle, following his usual custom,¹ gave the name of the archon with no distinguishing epithet. If this be granted, a plausible argument could be made for the earlier date from the financial condition of Athens just before the collapse of the Sicilian expedition. The answer to these objections is to be found in the passage in the *Frogs* upon which the scholiast's comment is made. Since the historical allusion has regularly been missed by modern commentators, I shall present the case at some length.

**Ἰακχε, φιλοχορευτά, συμπρόπεμπέ με*

404. *σὺ γὰρ κατεσχίσω μὲν ἐπὶ γέλῳτι
κάπ' εὐτελείᾳ τόν τε σανδαλίσκον
καὶ τὸ ῥάκος, κάξεῦρες ὥστ'
ἀζημίους παίζειν τε καὶ χορεύειν.*

Schol. ad loc.: *σὺ γὰρ κατεσχίσω] ἴσον τῷ διὰ σέ κατεσχίσθη. . . . ἔοικε δὲ παρεμφαίνειν ὅτι λιτῶς ἤδη ἐχορηγεῖτο τοῖς ποιηταῖς. (ἐπὶ γοῦν τοῦ Καλλίου τοῦτου φησὶν Ἀριστοτέλης ὅτι σύνδυο ἔδοξε χορηγεῖν τὰ Διονύσια τοῖς τραγῳδοῖς καὶ κωμῳδοῖς* ὥστε ἴσως ἦν τις καὶ περὶ τὸν Αἰναικὸν ἀγῶνα συστολή, χρόνῳ δ' ὕστερον οὐ πολλῷ τινι καὶ καθάπαξ περιεῖλε Κινησίας τὰς χορηγίας κτέ.)*²

The scholiast did not understand the purpose of the change, for it was the intention of the legislator to give the poets undiminished support, while reducing by one-half the expense of each choregus. The scholiast was misled by a literal interpretation of *κατεσχίσω*, saw in the passage only another allusion to the stinginess of the choregi, and was withal too eager to find a premonition of the total abolition of the choregia, which, he believed, was soon to be accomplished. That it was not abolished by Cinesias is sufficiently shown by Aristotle, *Ἀθ. πολ.* 56, 3. The whole interpretation of the scholiast must therefore be rejected, and we must go back to the text for the true meaning, using as the key the excerpt from Aristotle which some intelligent

¹ Wilamowitz, *Aristoteles und Athen*, p. 8.

² It will be observed that the quotation from Aristotle is not in the *Codex Ravennas*. It is apparent, however, that, as they stand, both scholia agree in the interpretation, though the reference to Aristotle is no longer in point. Probably the source of the second scholium had the correct understanding of the passage, simply quoting Aristotle in explanation.

commentator of an early date wrote on the margin of the manuscript. It seems to me that we have in the text not simply a general allusion to the shabby costume with which the choreutae must needs be content, although that is there, but a direct reference to the joint choregia of two men which had been introduced that year, and for which the chorus expresses its gratitude to Iacchus, ὁ φιλοχορευτής, who has come to the rescue of his worshippers at this time of need and has preserved their rites unharmed. As the poet would put it, the choregia "has been split." In his usual manner he mingles fact and fancy, the literal and the metaphorical, to the confusion of commentators ancient and modern.¹ The historical allusion comes first. Iacchus is the friend of the dancer, "for thou it is who didst have my little sandal and my tattered garment split in twain for fun and for economy, and didst hit upon a way whereby I might play and dance unharmed." Then another member of the chorus takes up the literal meaning of the words and the ἐπὶ γέλῳτι to point the characteristic jest: νῦν δὲ κατείδον, καὶ μάλ' εὐπροσώπου, συμπαιστρίας, χιτωνίου παραρραγέντος, τιθίον προκίψαν. To my mind the conclusion is irresistible that the synchoregia, so explicitly referred to in this passage, if the proposed interpretation is correct, was an event of recent date.²

The question has been raised as to whether the scholiast rightly understands τὰ Διονύσια in the statement of Aristotle to mean the City Dionysia alone. Brinck³ leaves the question in doubt, though he inclines to the belief that both festivals are included in the expression. Bergk⁴ believed that the law passed under

¹ Nor is the advantage in favor of the modern. See, for example, Kock's comments on the passage. The textual changes which he and Blaydes propose, and of which others have approved, are, it need hardly be said, unnecessary.

² The allusion to the χορηγία in the Frogs is indicated not only by the epithet φιλοχορευτής and by κατεσχίσω, but also by χορεύειν, which here means 'to serve as χορευτής.' See Wilamowitz, Herakles², II, p. 149.

Bodensteiner, op. cit., p. 78, concedes the claim of Oehmichen that Lys. 21, 1, καταστάς δὲ χορηγὸς τραγῳδοῖς ἀνήλωσα τριάκοντα μνᾶς (in the year 411/10), is against the synchoregia, not, however, on the ground that the speaker names no fellow-choregus, but because the sum expended is too large. He suggests that the text is corrupt. But I believe that the phraseology in all such cases excludes the supposition of a joint choregia, and that this passage could be used, if necessary, as a further argument against the date 412/11.

³ Op. cit., p. 94: "si Athenis lex ferebatur σύνδωο χορηγεῖν τὰ Διονύσια, bene statui potest, significata esse et Διονύσια τὰ μεγάλα et Διονύσια τὰ ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ."

⁴ Gesch. d. gr. Litt. III, p. 70, n. 275.

Callias was for the City Dionysia, but suggested that a similar law had previously been passed for the Lenaeae festival. At first glance it may seem that the Lenaea were included in the law of Callias, because the Frogs was produced at the Lenaea. On the other hand, τὰ Διονύσια and Διονύσια are the designations regularly given to the city festival in the fifth and fourth centuries. The addition of τὰ ἐν ἄστει or τὰ ἀστικά is found only a few times in the fifth century, while τὰ μεγάλα does not occur until the latter part of the fourth century. In many instances it can be shown that τὰ Διονύσια and Διονύσια refer to the City Dionysia exclusively, and I have failed to find an instance where a reference to the Lenaea is implied with certainty. The usage of Aristotle in this matter is well illustrated in chap. 56 and 57 of the Πολιτεία, where Διονύσια is as distinctly opposed to Διονύσια τὰ ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ as Διονύσια τὰ μεγάλα. But the most convincing proof that Aristotle had in mind the city festival alone is furnished by Lys. 21, 4, where we are told that the speaker won a victory as choregus for the comic poet Cephisodorus in the archonship of Euclid. At this date a single person could have been appointed choregus only for the Lenaea.

It remains to determine the date of the discontinuance of the synchoregia. It will be convenient to discuss the tragic and the comic choregia separately, although the assumption seems to prevail that, as the two were treated alike in the law of Callias, so the expedient of the joint choregia must have been abandoned at the same time for both. Brinck¹ suggests that single choregi were again appointed when tragedies began to be presented singly. But, as A. Müller² points out, the inscription which he cites in support (CIA. II 973—date, 342–340) does not prove that the poets contested with single tragedies. In fact, CIA. IV 2, fr. g, p. 218 (348/7), proves the contrary—that one choregus provided for all the plays presented by each poet. This is about the time when Meidias served alone as choregus for tragedy (Dem. Meid. 156). Fragment c of CIA. II 971, which has been extracted by Köhler from the almost hopeless jumble of Pittakis' copy, and which is even now not very certain, bears the name of the archon Theodotus (387/6) and of the choregus and poet of the preceding year. Since tragedy is always the last event mentioned in these yearly records, it follows that in the year 388/7 a single choregus was appointed in tragedy.

¹ Op. cit., p. 95.

² Philologus, Supp. VI, p. 95.

The following inscription was first published by Philios in *Ath. Mitth.* 19 (1894), p. 174 f., and is now to be found in the *Attic Corpus*, IV 2, p. 254. It was found at Eleusis. The restorations are certain and will not be indicated.

Γυνᾱθις Τιμοκῆδος Ἀναξανδρίδης Τιμαγόρο
 χορηγῶντες κωμῳδοῖς ἐνίκων.
 Ἀριστοφάνης ἐδίδασκεν.
 ἑτέρα νίκη τραγωδοῖς.
 Σοφοκλῆς ἐδίδασκεν.

Foucart¹ has shown that it is extremely probable that the second victory was won by the younger Sophocles with his grandfather's play, the *Oedipus Coloneus*, in the year 401. As regards the victory in comedy, he argues as follows: "Les deux dernières lignes sont de la même main que les premières; ce n'est donc pas une addition faite postérieurement pour une victoire gagnée plus tard; l'inscription a été gravée en une seule fois. Par conséquent, la victoire tragique a été antérieure à la victoire comique." And so, he proceeds to say, the comic victory was won between 399 and 389. I confess that I am unable to understand the logic of this argument. If the two records were inscribed at the same time, the only indication of the order in which the victories were won is the order in which they are recorded. The *ἑτέρη νίκη* was unquestionably the second, and consequently the comic victory must have been won before 401 and after 405. Incidentally it may be said that in the comedy was possibly the *Γηρυτιάδης*, a play similar to the *Frogs* in conception, and produced about the same time.

In another synchoregic inscription, CIA. III 1280, three victories are grouped together in which the poets were Dicaeogenes, Ariphron and Polychares respectively. Köhler dates the inscription "ad initia saeculi quarti." Brinck (p. 106) thinks that the alphabet employed (ο for ου, but ω and η) points to a date not long after 411. Each is evidently influenced by the date which he accepts of the synchoregic law. Dicaeogenes² was a tragic poet, contemporary with Agathon, who flourished, as Kayser shows,³ between 424 and 393. Ariphron was not before known

¹ *Revue de Philologie*, 19 (1895), p. 119 ff. Köhler then is wrong in dating the inscription before Euclid.

² Welcker, *Die griechischen Tragödien*, p. 1045.

³ Kayser, *Hist. crit. trag. Graec.*, p. 251.

as a tragic poet, but he is probably Ariphron of Sicyon, the dithyrambic poet mentioned by Athenaeus 15, 702 *a*. About Polychares nothing is known. With this meagre information, and keeping as near 403 as possible, and assuming no long interval between the various victories that are recorded on the same stone, we may fix the date of the three victories approximately in the years 404, 403, 402, 400, 399. The year 401 and possibly 398 and 397 are already occupied by tragic victories.¹

Turning now to the contemporary literature, we are able to arrive at more definite results. In a number of orations of the early part of the fourth century the services of a number of citizens in the choregia are mentioned, always in such a manner that one must infer that they served singly. In Isaeus 5, 36 the speaker relates that Dicaeogenes was so stingy that he got last place when choregus for tragedy. The immediate context shows that this was between 399 and the time of speaking, 389. We learn from Lys. 19, 29 and 42 that Aristophanes was choregus for tragedy twice in five years—once for his father and once in his own name—and that he was trierarch three times in succession between the battle of Cnidus and his death in 389. Since the family had no property before this battle, so heavy a liturgy would hardly have been imposed on them in the year of the battle. The trierarchies must have been after 390, when the Athenians first fitted out a fleet after the war with Sparta. This leaves only 393/2 and 392/1 for the two choregies.² Therefore between 399, the latest date of a tragic synchoregia of which there is evidence, and 393, the tragic synchoregia was abolished. Taking into account the financial condition of Athens at this time, we may consider ca. 394 the probable date of the resumption of the single choregia for tragedy.³

Navarre⁴ appeals to CIA. II 971, fr. *d*, for proof that the comic synchoregia was given up in the course of the first half of the fourth century. Unfortunately this inscription, which tells of the

¹ 401, Oed. Col.; 398, first appearance (victory?) of Astydamos, cf. Mar. Par. 81; 397, appearance (and victory?) of the younger Sophocles; the Iph. Aul., Alcmeon and Bacchae were brought out soon after the death of Euripides. One of the above dates must therefore be reserved for these.

² This result is taken from Blass, *Att. Bered.*², p. 532, note.

³ We have no knowledge that, while the synchoregia was in operation, a single person might, under exceptional circumstances, be called upon to equip a chorus, as in the case of the syntrierarchia.

⁴ Dionysos, p. 16.

choregia of Diopeithes in a comic contest in which the poet Procleides was victor, bears no date. Köhler now assigns it to a period "several decades after the beginning of the fourth century."¹ It must, however, be assigned to a considerably later date.² The victory was won at the City Dionysia, for choruses of men and boys are mentioned in the record. Now, in the great inscription which gives the number of victories won by the various poets in the dramatic contests (CIA. II 977, fr. *g*), the comic poet Procleides is accredited with one victory. This list also refers to the City Dionysia. The identification seems certain. The name of Procleides comes immediately after Timocles and before Menander. Menander won his first victory in 321.³ Timocles won his single victory not a long time before, for it is not likely that, in a long interval, only one new poet should have been successful. Timocles was a contemporary of Demosthenes and Hypereides, but he exhibited as late as the second decade before 300.⁴ The earliest comedy of his that can be dated was produced about 345.⁵ From these indications we should be reasonably safe in dating the victory of Timocles and that of Procleides within about a decade before 321. Fragment *d*, therefore, of this list of victors at the City Dionysia, originally had a place near fragments *h* and *e*, which belong together, the first column of fr. *h* being continued by the second column of fr. *e*. It will readily be seen by reference to the facsimiles that unless we can date the victory of Procleides before 335, which we have shown to be improbable, fr. *d* can find a place only between fr. *h*, col. 1 and fr. *e*, col. 2, and hence is the record for the year 332/1. Another fragment of the same inscription (fr. *h*, CIA. IV, p. 219) gives a single choregus for comedy in the record for 330/29.

The metrical inscription CIA. III 1285 has been the subject of considerable discussion. As restored by Köhler, the first line reads:

ἡδὺ γέλῳτι χορῶ Διονύσια σ[ύ]μ[π]οτε ἐν[ίκων].

¹ He at first assigned it to the beginning of the fourth century. *Ath. Mitth.* 3 (1878), p. 109.

² Oehmichen cannot have examined this inscription very carefully, for he cites it as proof that the synchoregia, if it ever existed, was "nicht von langem Bestande": *op. cit.*, p. 196.

³ Anon. de comoedia, III 81 (Dübner).

⁴ Bergk, *Gesch. gr. Litt.* III, p. 163.

⁵ Meineke, I, pp. 387 and 429.

It is accordingly a synchoregic inscription, as is now admitted by all. Köhler thinks that the reference is to a victory won at Athens, to commemorate which the choregi set up a stone in their own deme—for the inscription was found outside of Athens. Reisch¹ evidently shares this view, for he considers this inscription a refutation of the statement of Schol. Ran. 404, that Cinesias abolished the choregia. Brinck,² however, yields to the authority of the scholiast on this point, and is compelled to explain this inscription (and CIA. II 1278) as commemorating a victory at the Rural Dionysia in the deme to which the choregi belonged. Now the story of the abolition of the choregia by Cinesias is a fiction built upon the epithet *χοροκτόνος* applied to him by the comic poet Strattis,³ and is abundantly refuted by unimpeachable evidence. Brinck's view, however, may be correct so far as CIA. II 1278 is concerned—an inscription found outside of Athens, referring to a comic choregia of a single person. But as regards this metrical inscription, the fact that it involves the synchoregia, an arrangement which we know to have existed in Athens, and which did not, so far as we know, obtain anywhere else, certainly puts upon Brinck the burden of proof, and gives us the right to refer this document to a victory won at Athens. An example precisely analogous to this is furnished by the synchoregic inscription from Eleusis discussed above. This metrical inscription is dated by Köhler, on epigraphical grounds, after the middle of the fourth century. The comic synchoregia, therefore, continued until after 350 and was discontinued before 332.

Very little direct evidence on the subject of the tribal choregia for comedy can be drawn from documents at present available. The only direct information which we have is given by Aristotle in *Ἀθ. πολ.* 56, 3 *πρότερον δὲ καὶ κωμφοδοῖς καθίστη (ὁ ἄρχων) πέντε (χορηγούς), νῦν δὲ τούτους αἱ φυλαὶ φέρουσιν*. I have advanced the view elsewhere, on the strength of the history of the chorus, that the change from appointment of choregi by the archon to election by the tribes took place after 350. The history of the synchoregia, in my opinion, is in favor of this view. There is nothing to show that the institution of the synchoregia in 406 was attended immediately by the increase of the comedies to be presented

¹ De mus. Graec. certam., p. 45.

² Op. cit., p. 139 f.

³ See my article on 'The Chorus in the later Greek Drama': Am. Jour. Arch. 10 (1895), p. 316 ff.

from three to five, as Wilamowitz assumes.¹ On the contrary, it seems to me extremely improbable, when one considers that the synchoregia was adopted under stress of great financial difficulties. When money became easier, at some time before 388,² it pleased the people better, instead of reverting to the old system of single choregi, to increase the number of comedies to be provided for. Nor is there evidence that the method of appointing was changed at that time. Selection by the tribes came only when the synchoregia was given up. We may infer from Aristotle's *πρότερον* that the change was made not long before. The omission of all mention of the tribe in the two official inscriptions of this period which refer to the comic choregia (CIA. II 971, fr. *d*, and CIA. IV, fr. *h*, p. 219) shows that the part of the tribe consisted only in the election of the choregi, and that it did not share in the victory, at least not in the same sense and degree as in the case of the cyclic choruses.³ The selection of the comic choregi by the tribes was naturally suggested by the number (5) of the comic poets to be provided for, and was finally brought about at a time (1) when the cost of the comic choregia had fallen off considerably, so that the co-operation of two chorēgi for each poet was unnecessary, (2) when the number of rich citizens had diminished, so that it was easier to find five choregi than ten, and (3) when the burden of the liturgies was very unequally distributed. It would be most natural under such circumstances that the abolition of the synchoregia should have been accompanied by the transfer of the appointing power to the tribes, for the main object aimed at, viz. a more equal distribution of the burden according to wealth, could not so easily be accomplished if the appointing power rested with the archon. Now

¹ Aristoteles u. Athen, I, p. 254, note 144. The whole account of the choregia which Wilamowitz outlines here seems to me to be extremely inexact. He assumes that *πρότερον καθίστη* in Aristotle refers to an intermission in the custom which prevailed from the beginning of the selection of comic choregi by the tribes. The only safe inference, however, is that the appointing power was vested in the archon from the time of the admission of comedy into the City Dionysia, and that it so remained until transferred to the tribes, not long before the time of writing. My statement of Wilamowitz's position on this point on p. 319, n. 45 of my article on the Chorus is inexact.

² The first recorded occurrence of five comedies was in 388, when the Plutus was presented. See Hypothesis to Plutus.

³ Navarre is therefore not justified in saying, p. 16, n. 3: "ce furent des concours non plus entre individus mais entre tribus."

the period in which the economic conditions which I have described are to be found in the highest degree was the period embraced in the financial administration of Lycurgus. The same tendency to throw upon the very rich the burdens which had previously rested upon them with less weight than upon the well-to-do citizens was exhibited during this period in still other directions. The propositions made by Demosthenes in 340 in regard to the symmories, for example, and the diversion of the theoric fund toward the expenses of war, accomplished in 338, were both steps in the same direction. The very rich were the chief opponents of these measures because they would suffer most heavily by the change. The abolition of the synchoregia and the transfer of the appointing power to the tribes was a very simple method of accomplishing, in the matter of the choregia, a reform for which a more complicated machinery was necessary in the case of the trierarchia. If we should assign this double change to ca. 340, I believe that we should not be far astray. The advantage of the change to the moderately wealthy was offset by a loss of administrative power, which became the cause of great changes in the form¹ and the manner of presentation of comedy; for the tribes could not insist so effectively as the archon on the maintenance of a high standard and a liberal supply of money on the part of the choregi. At a time when public spirit was at a low ebb, a strong directing hand was the more necessary.

The main results of this investigation into the history of the dramatic synchoregia may be summarized as follows. In 406 a law was passed providing for the conjunction of two citizens in the tragic and comic choregia for the City Dionysia. Between 399 and 394—probably nearer the latter date—this law was repealed for tragedy, while for comedy the synchoregia was retained, and before 388 the number of comedies to be presented was increased to five. This arrangement lasted until about 340, when the old usage was reestablished. Probably at the same time the appointment of comic choregi was transferred from the archon to the tribes. The victory, however, continued to belong to the choregus as official representative of the chorus and the tribe.

EDWARD CAPPS.

¹ See *Am. Jour. Arch.* 1895, p. 319.